



United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/039,826	10/23/2001	Tatsuo Kaizu	275744US6	9532
22850	7590 07/18/2006		EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			SHEPARD, JUSTIN E	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2623	
		DATE MAILED: 07/18/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/039,826	KAIZU ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Justin E. Shepard	2623	

	Justin E. Snepard	2623				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) ☑ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH	g date of the final reject	on.			
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropr inally set in the final Off	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as			
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) They raise new issues that would require further co (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a second content of the present additional claims without canceling a second content of the present additional claims without canceling a second content of the present additional claims without canceling a second content of the proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, 	nsideration and/or search (see NO w); ter form for appeal by materially re	TE below);				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.115. 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		ill be entered and an o	explanation of			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to construct showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).			
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See arguments.	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:			
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	No(s)				

Application/Control Number: 10/039,826

Art Unit: 2623

Response to Arguments

Page 2

Applicant's arguments filed 6/23/06 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

Page 4, second paragraph (referring to claim 1):

The applicant argues that there is nothing in Elliot to suggest "automatically

obtaining code information from a server if unavailable in local memory." As cited in the

Office Action, Elliot states that either some or all of the code library may be downloaded

to the memory. The applicant cites column 3, lines 48-53 of Elliot on page 3 which

clearly states that a "device configured to access the World Wide Web...by accessing a

particular website and selecting codes that are appropriate for the device of for the

desired functionality of the device." Elliot makes no mention of the user manually

navigating to a website and the examiner interprets this as meaning that the device

itself navigates to the website to automatically download the necessary codes to

perform the required action. Therefore the rejection stands.

Page 5, last paragraph:

The applicant argues that the rejection of the independent claim is invalid, and

therefore the rejections of the dependent claims are also invalid. As the rejection of the

independent claim is valid, so are the rejections of the dependent claims.

CHRISTOPHER GRANT SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600